

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3, 6, 11, 16, 21 and 26 have been amended. Claims 4-5, 14-15, and 24-25 were previously canceled. Claims 1-3, 6-13, 16-23, and 26-30 remain pending in the application. Reconsideration is respectfully requested in light of the foregoing amendments and following remarks.

Examiner Interview:

Applicants appreciate the courtesies extended by the examiner in the telephone interview of January 5, 2011. During the interview, Examiner Chankong agreed that the above amendment would overcome the current rejection and most likely make the case allowable pending the Examiner's updated search.

Section 102(e) Rejection:

The Office Action rejected claims 1-3, 6-13, 16-23 and 26-30 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Zintel et al. (U.S. Patent 6,725,281) (hereinafter "Zintel"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Nevertheless, in order to expedite prosecution, Applicants have presented the above amendments to further clarify reasons why the current rejection, inasmuch as it may be applied to the amended claims, is not supported by the evidence of record.

Regarding claim 1, Zintel fails to disclose at least the features of a client, sending a lookup message to a space, wherein the lookup message specifies desired characteristics of documents stored within the space and the client receiving a lookup response indicating identifiers of discovered documents within the space that, in addition to being stored in the space, match the desired characteristics, as recited in amended claim 1.

As discussed in the telephone interview of January 5, 2011, and as the Final Office Action has noted at page 4, Zintel discloses a UCP obtaining all service definitions provided by the controlled device. This “blanket send” does not anticipate the newly recited “sending a lookup message to a space, wherein the lookup message specifies desired characteristics of documents stored within the space and the client receiving a lookup response indicating identifiers of discovered documents within the space that, in addition to being stored in the space, match the desired characteristics.” As discussed in the telephonic interview, features recited in claim 1 indicate a level of granularity in query-response behavior that is neither taught nor suggested in Zintel. Claim 1 likewise recites that “the service advertisement is a document expressed in a markup language and listed in the discovered documents.” Because Zintel lacks the feature of “a lookup response indicating identifiers of discovered documents,” Zintel neither teaches nor suggests and could not accommodate the service advertisement that is “a document expressed in a markup language and listed in the discovered documents.”

For at least the reasons above, the rejection of claim 1 is not supported by the cited art and removal thereof is respectfully requested. Similar remarks apply to claims 11 and 21.

Applicants also assert that numerous ones of the dependent claims recite further distinctions over the cited art. However, since the rejection has been shown to be unsupported for the independent claims, a further discussion of the dependent claims is not necessary at this time.

CONCLUSION

Applicants submit the application is in condition for allowance, and an early notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

If any fees are due, the Commissioner is authorized to charge said fees to Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert, & Goetzel, P.C. Deposit Account No. 501505/5181-64900/RCK.

Respectfully submitted,

/Robert C. Kowert/
Robert C. Kowert, Reg. #39,255
Attorney for Applicants

Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert, & Goetzel, P.C.
P.O. Box 398
Austin, TX 78767-0398
Phone: (512) 853-8850

Date: January 12, 2011